

## REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Action dated April 10, 2007 ("the Office Action"). In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,690,932 B1 to Barnier *et al.* (herein *Barnier*) and Claim 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Barnier*. In response, Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and make the above amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment, Claim 10 is amended, no claims are cancelled and no claims are added. Therefore, **Claims 1 – 20 are currently pending**. As set forth more fully below, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is amended to change correct three typographical errors.

The present invention is directed to a system and method for administering information permission requests from an information user for permission to use information owned by an information owner. The system includes an information control unit that compares an information permission request with information use directions. The information permission request includes an identification of the information and the use circumstance(s). The information use directions include criteria for permitted use of the information. The present invention also includes a communications facility that interfaces the information control unit to information users and an information storage unit that stores the information use directions.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 – 20 are patentable over *Barnier*, because *Barnier* does not disclose or suggest many of the elements of Applicants' claimed invention. In fact, the use of Applicants' invention in the system of *Barnier* would provide a heightened level of information security than is disclosed or suggested in *Barnier*.

In regards to the preamble of Claim 1, the Examiner states that "Barnier teaches a system for administering permission for use of specified information..." Applicants respectfully disagree. Supplemental information in *Barnier* is always delivered without regards to permission. If there is a flag of some sort in the ALI data, then the call taker can

always obtain supplemental information. Col. 24, lines 18 – 59. There is no teaching or suggestion that the call taker cannot obtain supplemental information if the flag is not set. The flag merely indicates that supplemental information is present. Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Barnier* that there is any check for permission to use supplemental information; it is always available.

As to Claim 1, element (a), the Examiner cites *Barnier's* FIG. 8, element 352 as representing an “information control unit.” It is respectfully submitted that element 352, FIG. 8 is the start of a flow chart. Element 352 is described as “[t]he method 350 begins with the step of providing, in no particular order, as indicated by a block 352.” The block is also labeled “providing.” Col.24, lines 14 – 16. The Examiner also cites Col 24, lines 14 – 59 as teaching or suggesting Applicants’ information control unit because “an information control unit includes an information-store unit, a notification facility and a dispatch facility.” Applicants do not claim or define their “information control unit” as comprising an information store unit, a notification facility or a dispatch facility. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s statement appears to be irrelevant. Clarification or withdrawal of this statement is respectfully requested.

The Examiner further states that “the use information request passed from PSAP system to the notification database is considered as an information use permission request.” (emphasis in the original) First of all, there is no “use information request” in *Barnier*. *Barnier* discloses a simple information request that has no permissions associated with it. Thus, there need not be a “use information permission request.” More importantly, however, is that the Examiner is herein using Applicants’ claim language in a manner not used or supported by Applicants’ claims and specification. Furthermore the Examiner does not explain why he is redefining Applicant’s “information use permission request.” The cited passages in *Barnier* do not shed any light on the Examiner’s interpretation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this redefinition be explained or withdrawn.

In (b) of the Examiner’s rejection, he states that “the notification facility of information control unit stores and processes the predetermined usage criteria and supplemental information regarding the subscriber accordingly; where the predetermined usage criteria is qualified as the predetermined information use directions.” (emphasis in the

original.) In the cited passage, *Barnier* is discussing notifying service subscribers. Col. 24, lines 25 – 32. *Barnier* does not teach or suggest “predetermined information use directions;” instead, *Barnier* is teaching when to notify (call) other people when someone dials 9-1-1. Again, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is redefining the functionality of *Barnier* using Applicants’ claim terminology as a road map and respectfully request that this redefinition be further explained or withdrawn.

Finally, in regard to Claim 1 (a), the Examiner cites *Barnier* Column 24 lines 33 – 40 as teaching Applicants’ “predetermined use criteria.” It is respectfully submitted that the cited passage in *Barnier* is teaching criteria for when others are to be notified in an emergency, not whether information may be released. As a result, most or all of element (a) in Claim 1 are not taught or suggested in *Barnier*. As a result, Claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

As to element (b) of Claim 1, the Examiner states that Applicants’ limitation of “communicating a permitting indicator to said at least on information user” corresponds to “the request from PSAP may be responded until the checking of predetermined usage criteria and supplemental information regarding the subscriber and the supplemental information has been successfully retrieved by the ALI notification system.” Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s statement is vague and confusing. Applicants cannot find the statement made by the Examiner in the cited passage in *Barnier*. Applicants respectfully request that this statement be clarified or withdrawn. Most or all of element (b) of Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by *Barnier*, therefore Claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

As to element (c) of Claim 1, Applicants agree that *Barnier* teaches an information store.

Because at least elements (a) and (b) are not taught or suggested by *Barnier*, Claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Independent claims 10 and 15 are rejected on the same grounds as Claim 1. For the sake of brevity, Applicants incorporate the arguments made in the discussion of Claim 1 into their arguments for Claims 10 and 15 as if they were set forth here in their entirety. Therefore, claims 10 and 15 are allowable over the art of record.

Claim 2 – 9, 11 – 14 and 16 – 20 are now allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, entry of this amendment and early notification of same is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael B. Johannesen/  
Michael B. Johannesen, Reg. No. 35,557  
Intrado  
1601 Dry Creek Drive  
Longmont, Colorado 80503

Telephone: (630) 430-1502  
(630) 300-2727

Date: July 10, 2007